

published over 40 monographs and a large number of essays. In 1973, he received a doctorate from the Taishan University in recognition of his research on Chan Buddhism. As a successor of the famous reformer Tai-xu, Yin-shun spearheaded an intellectual renaissance of Taiwanese Buddhism, confronting the influence of superstitions, empty rituals and blind devotion. Thanks to the historical perspective introduced by him, the *Āgamas* have become the object of a revival of interest and study in Chinese Buddhist circles.

Bibliography: Bingenheimer 2004: *Der Mönchsgelehrte Yinshun (*1906) und seine Bedeutung für den chinesisch-taiwanischen Buddhismus im 20. Jahrhundert*, Heidelberg. Chu: "Yinshun", in *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Buswell (ed.), New York: Macmillan, vol. 2, 2004: 913.

Anālayo

YODHĀJĪVA SUTTA is the title of a discourse found in the *Gaṇaṇi Saṃyutta* of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* (S. IV, 308), which has two Chinese parallels in the two extant *Saṃyukta Āgama* translations (T. II, 227b and T. II, 420b). The *Yodhājīva Sutta* records the Buddha's reply to an inquiry by a professional soldier, *yodhājīva*, if on being killed in battle while performing his duty as a warrior he will be reborn in heaven. The Buddha denies, informing his visitor that on that account he will rather end up in hell. The simple reason is that at the time of fighting the mind is full of desire to harm, kill and destroy, which will inevitably conduce to a hellish rebirth. Holding the wrong view that soldiers who die in battle will be reborn in heaven is another condition for a lower rebirth, conducive to a life in hell or in an animal realm. The same inquiry is posed again by a warrior specialized on riding an elephant and by one specialized on riding a horse in the two discourses that follow the *Yodhājīva Sutta* in the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, only to receive the same reply by the Buddha (S. IV, 310).

The unequivocally clear stance taken in these three discourses against warfare is remarkable, as it leaves little scope for endorsing warfare or developing the concept of a holy war. The position taken in these discourses stands "in sharp opposition to the dominant view of the time, according to which it was the particular duty of a kṣatriya, a member of the warrior

caste, to fight and, if at all possible, to die on the battlefield".¹

The *Yodhājīva Sutta* thus expresses with particular clarity the implications of the first precept incumbent on any Buddhist – abstaining from killing – adherence to which would make participation in a war impossible.² In fact, according to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* even in case of conscription a soldier is nevertheless guilty of killing, as is anyone who kills in self-defence or for the sake of defending others.³

The detailed treatment of the first precept in the *Sāleyyaka Sutta* indicates that adherence to this precept involves abstaining from killing, laying aside stick and sword, being conscientious, showing kindness, and dwelling full of compassion towards any living being, *pāṇātipātāpaṭivirato hoti, nihitadaṇḍo nihitasaṭṭho lajjī dayāpanno sabbapāṇabhūtahitānukampīviharati* (M. I, 287). The principle that inspires such conduct is the maxim, "just as I am, so are these; just as these are, so am I; comparing oneself [with others in this way], one would not kill or cause to kill", *yathā ahaṃ tathā eṭe, yathā eṭe tathā ahaṃ, attānaṃ upamaṃ katvā, na haneyya na ghātaye* (Sn. 705).

For a monk or a nun, killing a human being will cause loss of their monastic status. This applies even in case of merely encouraging the act of killing, without directly participating in it (*Vin.* III, 71). Hence a Buddhist monastic who advocates war risks losing the right to be reckoned a *bhikkhu* or a *bhikkunī*. The degree to which warfare was seen as censurable in early Buddhism can also be seen in other *Vinaya* regulations, which make it an offence to watch an army in combat or even just to witness an army review (*Vin.* IV, 105 and 107). The same disdain for warfare is also reflected in the circumstance that armies and battles are topics on which one should not even converse (M. III, 113).

To encourage others to kill involves a loss of ethical purity for a lay follower of Buddhism as well. This is so since to fully undertake the precept of abstaining from killing requires not only refraining oneself from such deeds, but also to discourage others from killing and to praise abstention from killing (S. V, 354). Only if undertaken in this way will the precept be kept entirely pure in all these three respects, *tikoṭiparisuddha*.

An *arahant*, then, is totally incapable of engaging in any killing (*D.* III, 133). Nevertheless, an *arahant* can also be reckoned a warrior, as is indeed the case in two *Yodhājīva Suttas* found in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and in their Chinese parallels (*A.* III, 89 and *A.* III, 93; *T.* II, 686c and *T.* II, 687b). Unlike the *Yodhājīva Sutta* of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, these two discourses only refer to a warrior in the context of a simile. According to this simile, by destroying all unwholesome states an *arahant* is like a warrior who comes out of battle as a victor. That is, from the perspective of early Buddhism the true battle is to be fought within.

*Yo sahaṣṣaṃ sahaṣṣena
saṅgāme mānuse jine,
ekañca jeyyam attānaṃ
sa ve saṅgāmajuttamo.*

Though one may conquer a thousand men
For a thousand times in battle,
A far greater conquest
Would be to conquer oneself (*Dhp.* 103).

See also **WAR AND PEACE**

Anālayo

References

- 1 Zimmerman: "War", *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, New York 2004: 893; on justification of violence in ancient Indian texts cf. also Tola and Dragonetti: "Buddhism in face of justification of violence in ancient India", *Maha Bodhi*, 101.2, 1993: 41-50.
- 2 Harris: *Violence and Disruption in Society*, Kandy 1994: 46, comments that "to break this [first precept] intentionally is to risk serious kammic consequences. For the lay person, as for the monk, the approved line of action would seem to be advice and non-violent pressure or resistance towards those in a position to change violent structures"^L.
- 3 Pradhan: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*, Orissa 1967: 243,8 and 240,19.

YOGA, from √ *yuj*, stands for "yoking" or "being yoked" and thus can mean "application", in the sense of making an endeavour, or else "bondage". Occurrences of the term *yoga* in the early discourses fall into these two main categories, where *yoga* either

assumes a positive sense as an application to something that should be undertaken, or else carries a negative sense as a form of bondage that needs to be overcome.

These two senses of the term *yoga* express a recurrent pattern in the teachings of early Buddhism, where the distinction between what is wholesome and what is unwholesome makes the crucial difference. Thus to 'yoke' oneself to wholesome qualities and actions is a central means for progress on the path and therefore something entirely commendable. But to be 'yoked' to something unwholesome is to fall prey to the influence of attachment and craving and hence should at all costs be avoided. The same two fold perspective also applies to terms such as desire, *chanda*, or even craving, *taṇhā*, which depending on the object they take can carry a positive or a negative sense. In the case of craving, a positive sense of the term occurs in one discourse where it represents a wholesome factor that leads to overcoming unwholesome forms of craving, *taṇham nissāya taṇhā, pahātabbā* (*A.* II, 145, see also TAṆHĀ). While this is an exceptional case, as most occurrences of the term *taṇhā*, have negative implications, the term *yoga* frequently carries positive connotations. In what follows, these positive nuances of the term *yoga* will be examined, followed by surveying instances where the same term has negative implications.

Yoga as a Commendable Form of Application

Already "in the Vedic period the term " *yuj* " *yoga* was used in the sense of 'to yoke, or join or harness (horses)'. It is no doubt from this meaning that the term began to imply the act of fixing the mind upon an object".¹ In a passage in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, *yoga* then stands for control of the senses and the calming of the mind.²

A verse in the *Theragāthā* brings out the positive connotations of the term *yoga* in early Buddhism, recommending that one should apply oneself to tranquility and insight at the proper time (*Th.* 584) *Yoga* will lead to wisdom, *yogāve jāyati bhūri*, whereas lack of application will result in loss of wisdom, *ayogā bhūri saṅkhayo* (*Dhp.* 282). Hence a factor that leads to progress is when a monk applies himself much, *yogabhūlo* (*A.* III, 432); and even to recollect *yogis* of former time will be conducive to progress towards liberation (*Th.* 947).

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF BUDDHISM

Founder Editor-in Chief

G. P. MALALASEKERA, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt., Professor Emeritus

Editor-in Chief

W. G. WEERARATNE, M. A., Ph. D.

VOLUME VIII

FASCICLE 3 : Vācā – Z hong a-han



2009